

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. The support of the claims may be found in paragraph [0043] and FIG. 9. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerpheide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,680,731) in view of Gerpheide (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,875) and further in view of Taylor et al. (U.S. Pre-Grant Pub. No. 2003/0025679), and in further view of Asher (U.S. Patent No. 5,159,159). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, recite an input device “wherein a protrusion dimension of a portion of the insulating layer which overlaps the extension section is shorter than a protrusion dimension of the extension section such that the insulating layer does not overlap an end portion of the lead wiring of the X and Y electrodes bundled in the extension section, **the extension section having a plurality of extension holes**”. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these limitations.

The Office Action, at page 5, concedes that the combination of Gerpheide and Taylor does not disclose “wherein a protrusion dimension of a portion of the insulating layer which overlaps the extension section is shorter than a protrusion dimension of the extension section such that the insulating layer does not overlap an end portion of the

lead wiring of the X and Y electrodes bundled in the extension section.” The Office Action relies on Asher to supplement the deficiencies of the combination of Gerpheide and Taylor. Applicants respectfully disagree. Asher discloses that a connector tab 21 extends beyond element 23. (Fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 10-12). However, the connector tab does not have any through holes. Asher does not disclose an **extension section having a plurality of extension holes**. Claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the cited reference for at least this reason.

Further, claims 1 and 8 recite an input device configured such that “a detection electrode S comprising two **comb-shaped electrodes** is disposed on a surface of the insulating layer, each electrode of the comb-shaped electrodes is disposed alternately with respect to the Y electrodes, the front ends of the combs are disposed **opposite left to right**, the comb-shaped electrodes are clustered as one electrode in the center in the Y direction, and these extend up to the predetermined through holes.” The cited references are silent on these limitations.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct from the combination of references proposed by the Office Action. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections against independent claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims be removed. Claims 2-3 and 9-12, being claims dependent on an allowable base claim are allowable, without more.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./
Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200